

REMARKS

In an Office Action dated July 18, 2005, the Examiner objected to the Specification as not referring to trademarks properly. Applicant has amended the Specification so that all uses of the trademark SURLYN are capitalized. In addition, applicant has amended the Specification so that THERMOBOND 613, THERMOBOND 650 and SURLYN are referred to as laminating adhesives. Applicant respectfully submits that the Specification is in proper form.

Claims 6 and 10 were objected to as containing informalities. Applicant has amended these claims as suggested by the Examiner.

In the Office Action, claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement because the “formable silicone containing microcapsules” is not supported by the Specification. In addition, claims 1 and 4-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, because the specification does not enable the claims for the non-reactive silicone microcapsules. Applicant has amended claims 1, 10, and 18 to delete the word “formable” and to indicate that the silicone in the microcapsules is reactive. In other words, applicant has removed the word that the Examiner believes is not supported by the Specification and has inserted “reactive,” which has been indicated as being amply supported in the Specification. Paragraph 8 of the January 18, 2005 Office Action states that the claims are allowable over the art of record. In light of the amendment and those earlier statements, the applicants respectfully request that for claims 1, 10 and 18 the Section 112, first paragraph, rejection be withdrawn. The rejection of claims 2-9, 11-17 and 19-21 should also be withdrawn as they depend on amended claims 1, 10 and 18.

In the Office Action dated January 18, 2005, it was noted that claims 2 and 3 contain allowable subject matter. Applicant has added new claims 22 and 23 to claim the allowable subject matter acknowledged in originally filed claims 2 and 3.

The Examiner states that certain non-patent documents listed in the Information Disclosure Statement filed July 10, 2003 were not considered because the Examiner

could not determine their publication date. Enclosed herewith is a PTO 1449 with the one of those documents that shows the publication date. Applicant notes that the remaining document has been considered but because no publication date can determine will not be listed on a published patent.

As the applicants have overcome all substantive rejections and objections given by the Examiner and have complied with all requests properly presented by the Examiner, the applicants contend that this Amendment, with the above discussion, overcomes the Examiner's objections to and rejections of the specification pending claims. Therefore, the applicants respectfully solicit allowance of the application. If the Examiner is of the opinion that any issues regarding the status of the claims remain after this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative to expedite resolution of the matter.

Respectfully submitted,
Alberto Cavallaro, et al.

By: Simon B. Anolick

Simon B. Anolick
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 37,585
Phone No.: 847/576-4234
Fax No.: 847/576-3750